

## REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 22, 2008. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1-3, 11, and 13 are in independent form. New Claims 14-16 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 10-13 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0036918 (*Pintsov*); that Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pintsov* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0049446 (*Seljeseth*); and that Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pintsov* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0043636 (*Foster*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 11, and 13, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from *Pintsov* for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented method to facilitate auditing of data in a database. The method includes entering first data into a first database, and entering second data into at least one second database. Screen data for navigating to a location of the first data is received, and a command for navigating to the location of first data is issued, which command is based on the received screen data. The first data and the second data are compared to determine if the first and second data are substantially similar prior to an authorization for a transaction.

Important features of Claim 1 include “receiving screen data for navigating to a location of said first data,” and “issuing a command for navigating to said location of said first

data based on said screen data.” By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 1 is able to navigate through one or more screens to obtain the first data of interest for comparison with the second data. For example, these features may be used by travel brokers to confirm that an inputted rate to be quoted to a customer corresponds to a predetermined rate for a particular travel purchase,<sup>1</sup> thus enabling input of errors to be discovered easily and avoiding a misquote of the rate.

*Pintsov* relates to a system and a method for paying utility bills employing independent verification of the utility bill by the customer. Apparently, *Pintsov* teaches that fee calculations may be compared either by a customer or a utility service provider. The utility service provider may send or download to a customer's computer a utility generated fee calculation for comparison with a customer generated fee calculation. Alternatively, a customer may send or download to a utility service provider's computer a customer generated fee calculation for comparison with a utility generated fee calculation.

Nothing has been found in *Pintsov* that is believed to teach or suggest “receiving screen data for navigating to a location of said first data,” and “issuing a command for navigating to said location of said first data based on said screen data,” as claimed in Claim 1. Moreover, nothing has been found in *Seljeseth* and *Foster* that is believed to teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Pintsov*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claims 11 and 13 include features similar to those discussed above, in which screen data for navigating to a location of the first data is received, and a command for navigating to the location of the first data is issued, where the command is based on the received

---

<sup>1</sup> The example(s) provided herein are intended to be illustrative and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

screen data. Therefore, Claims 11 and 13 also are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/  
Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 2130241\_2.DOC